

the imperfect knowledge, the indecent hurry, and the lack of consideration of counsel from those competent to advise on the subject, with the extravagance and inefficiency in administration which has followed, in the main are not too strongly stated.

Dr. Brend has little to tell us of value on the side of reconstruction. In this direction he is seriously handicapped by his obvious lack of knowledge of the extent and the success of the work already accomplished by sanitary authorities. His remedies are remedies *pour rire*. He would add one more to the present large number of central and local authorities engaged in public health work, an additional Ministry "side by side with the present departments." This would provide "an investigating authority . . . the greatest necessity in our present system," additional duties being subsequently added to this Ministry one by one. With the contention that science, and especially medical science, should take a much more active share in the central administration of public health we entirely agree; but Dr. Brend assumes that the experts who must consider departmental medical and lay proposals must not be officially connected with these departments and must decide *ex cathedra* as well as *ab extra* on doubtful points. There are many questions needing independent research which are capable of being investigated extra-departmentally; and recent State endowment of industrial and medical research has done much to meet this need. There is also need for further sociological and statistical inquiries in addition to those already undertaken by the central departments concerned; and the Government would be well advised to make further provision in these directions. But Dr. Brend's conception of a Ministry of Health consisting of experts "comparable with, let us say, the geological survey," the consent of which must be obtained before public health advances are permitted to become operative, if accepted, would lead to clogging and obstruction of social amelioration, worse than now occurs with an unnecessarily large number of central and local authorities.

Administration and research cannot safely be separated. The administrator knows how to temper and sift the practicable from the impracticable in academic results which usually need revision from time to time; and the expert can often suggest valuable lines of useful administration. But if the two are divorced, all past experience shows that inefficiency must result.

In regard to local administration Dr. Brend is even more unsatisfactory. Our popularly elected local authorities are not to be entrusted with local health administration. This is to be given to a non-elective body, the present local authority being left with the residue of administration—what would it be? There is a better way; but here we must be content with a naked statement of Dr. Brend's proposal.

Dr. Brend's book is stimulating and useful for the well-informed reader. For others it will be misleading, as they do not possess the knowledge required to secure for them the stimulus without being misled in some not unimportant particulars.

Report of the Conference on New Ideals in Education held at Oxford from July 29th to August 5th, 1916. Obtainable from the Secretary, 24, Royal Avenue, Chelsea; pp. 267; price 2s.

THE annual conference of "educational idealists" under the leadership of the Earl of Lytton, whose doings (or sayings) in 1916 are herein reported, appears to have developed out of a conference on Montessori methods, held at Runton in 1914, and is evidently a growing affair which has "caught on." It is one of the several indications that there are still possibilities of life in the dry bones even of the driest educational disciplines, and it is a good sign of progress that new ideals, and even "fads," should crop up to be ventilated and cross-questioned. Education

is a social function which has never been a complete success and given universal satisfaction. It has been a field of controversy and recrimination between the amateur (the parents) and the professional, ever since the gross and painful failure of Adam and Eve (themselves devoid of education) to educate their boys, drove mankind in despair to devise the pedagogue. The experiments in education expounded in this book are nearly all, however, small beginnings. They are evidently still in the "laboratory" stage, and incapable of application on a national scale. Their scope may be indicated by an enumeration—handicraft, Boy Scouts, regional study, stress on "science," abolition of examinations, physiological education and independent study in elementary schools, the Caldecott Community (very entertaining) new methods of classifying infants (improved Montessori) and of handwriting, the plans for the University of Benares, and the Open-Air school (apparently a "Hun" importation which is neither Peripatetic nor Academic). All this is prefaced with some sensible papers on religious education, interspersed with appreciative allusions to Madame Montessori, Monsieur Dalcroze, and the Little Commonwealth, and garnished with benedictions by Heads of Oxford colleges, the Master of University (Vice-Chairman), the Dean of Christ Church, the Provost of Oriel, and the Master of Balliol.

In spite of this varied *repertoire*, however, there are notable *lacunæ*, and some very burning questions are cautiously shirked. For instance, the sex problem (to which the allusion is so slight as to be nugatory) and the conflict between "work" and "games." Also Dr. Macan's complacent belief that by some recent changes of regulations Oxford has done all that is needed to protect research against its dominant rival, examination (p. 130), will hardly bear examination. Even the discussion of the place of science in general education, what should be meant by "science," and how it should (if possible) be taught and with what end, was hardly adequate, though Sir Henry Miers's paper was a good one. Lastly, in this REVIEW it may be proper to express some slight surprise that the ever-vigilant authorities of the Eugenics Education Society did not succeed in seizing the opportunity of infusing some of the strong wine of eugenics into the milk-and-water of eurhythmics!

It is evident that to complete our survey of educational possibilities we need also a reasoned and comprehensive re-statement of the *old* ideals. To obtain this should not be impossible, for everywhere the convulsions of the times are overpowering the inertia of the *beati possidentes* attitude. When we have obtained full statements of all sides of the problem, we shall need impartial philosophers to correlate them in a broad, synthetic and sympathetic spirit. For there is real danger of unthinking acquiescence in catchwords, old and new, and hasty action. Revolutions in educational policy are the more dangerous because their fruits take so long to mature. A generation (at least) is required to discover when they have failed.

F. C. S. SCHILLER.

Bryant, V. SEYMOUR, M.A. *The Public School System.* Published for the Committee on the Neglect of Science by Longman, Green and Co.; 1917; price 1s. 6d. net; pp. 75.

THIS is a vigorous controversial pamphlet, attacking classical headmasters and classical curricula. Much of the criticism is sound, but there is nothing new to be learned from Mr. Bryant's onslaught. His design, as disclosed in the last chapter, is to induce "our industrial princes to found an educational establishment" similar to the Naval Colleges of Osborne and Dartmouth. This projected public school is to exhibit all the fine qualities of classical public schools; and is to be far better staffed and equipped, because it will be planned for 1,000 boys (500 of these being in five separate preparatory departments). The devices of common kitchens and dining halls, common gymnasium and